

REMARKS

Entry of this amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 6-12 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 6-12 have been amended.

The specification is objected-to for failing to provide a summary of the invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for objecting to the specification. Applicant believes that the specification provides a clear summary of the invention on page 1, line 25-page 3, line 32, which states in part, [i]t is a first aim of embodiments of the present invention to provide a means for identifying applications or services relevant to a particular user. It is another aim of embodiments of the present invention to provide a method for generating a portal to information and applications on the Internet based on a personal profile and/or feedback from user queries to reduce application overload. According to a first aspect of the invention, there is provided a meta data category specifying types of web applications and services.... Preferably, within said meta data category a plurality of functional identifiers may be present, each functional identifier denoting a specific type of application or service available via the world wide web. The functional identifiers are building blocks for a task description language for describing the functionality of a web application or service. A web application document would contain a piece of text (or a link to a separate document) written in such a task description language ... Preferably, each functional identifier comprises one or more keywords identifying a type of application or service being offered by a web based provider....Preferably, the web browser is configured to deliver information to the user, based on a user profile, to personalise the portal. ... Personalisation does not have to happen inside the browser, the presentation in the form of a web document containing the personalised portal interface is preferably generated on the server. However, the user profile may be used to personalise the look-and-feel of the browser..."

For at least this reason, applicant believes that the instant invention is adequately summarized in the specification and respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 8-12 are objected to for containing informalities.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his observations regarding the form of the claims and has amended the claims to correct the informalities noted.

Having amended the claims applicant believes that the reason for the objection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 6-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraft (USP no. 6,529,899).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, the independent claims have been amended to more clearly state the invention. More specifically, the claims have been amended to recite "the meta data category describes the functionality of said applications and services ~~network site~~ as one or more functional identifiers." No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 2, lines 26-28, which state "[t]ypical applications or services identified by such functional identifiers may, for instance, comprise manufacturing, sales or repairing of physical items, the provision of professional, domestic or other services, etc."

Kraft discloses a system and method for associating a personalized application tool and/or service in response to data supplied by any number of search requests. (see ABSTRACT). Kraft discloses that "a user may select a desired resource and activate the associated tool and/or service and that the choice of tools is different depending on the return data type. For instance, with XML documents, the user has a choice of selecting a 'Tree View' tool that shows a graphical representation of the structure of the document." (see col. 3, lines 33-39). Kraft further discloses "[a]fter selecting a type-specific tool ... the [user] request is then sent to the present invention that in turn downloads the requested document and post processes this document using the desired tool." (see col. 3, lines 51-53).

Accordingly, Kraft teaches a device that allows a user to define a tool or service that may be used to process data retrieved from a request for information provided by a user. However, Kraft fails to teach searching on a meta data category that includes identifiers that describe the functionality of applications and services, as is recited in the claims. Contrary to the statements made in the Office Action, the functionalities of the applications claimed in the instant invention are not the same as the Classes, Abstract, Details and Map described by Kraft.

It is well recognized that to constitute a rejection pursuant to 35 USC §102, i.e., anticipation, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art.

Kraft cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Kraft fails to disclose each and every element recited. As shown, Kraft fails to teach a meta data category describing the functionality of applications and services.

At least for this reason, applicant submits that the rejection of the claim has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

With regard to the remaining independent claim 12, this claim recites subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1 and was rejected for the same reason used in rejecting claim 1. Thus, for the amendments made to claim 12, which are similar to the amendments made with regard to claim 1 and for the remarks made in response to the rejection of claim 1, which are also applicable in response to the rejection of claim 12, and reasserted, as if in full, herein, applicant submits that the reason for rejecting claim 12 has been overcome and the rejection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

With regard the remaining claims these claims ultimately depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to contain subject matter not disclosed by, and, hence, allowable over, the reference cited. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

For at least this reason, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079



Date: July 5, 2006

By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069


Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on July 5, 2006.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)


(Signature and Date)